

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

BRENT R. BARBER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 1:19-CV-981-ECM-WC
	)	[WO]
HOUSTON COUNTY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff filed this *pro se* U.S.C. § 1983 action challenging conditions at the Houston County Jail. After reviewing the complaint and finding deficiencies with this pleading, the court determined that Plaintiff should be provided an opportunity to file an amended complaint to correct the deficiencies. On December 18, 2019, the court entered a detailed order explaining the deficiencies in the complaint and providing Plaintiff with specific instructions regarding filing an amended complaint. Doc. 7. The court specifically advised Plaintiff “that this case will proceed only against the defendants named and claims presented in the amended complaint” and cautioned him that his failure to comply with the directives of the order would result in a Recommendation this case be dismissed. *Id.*

The time allowed Plaintiff to file the amended complaint expired on January 6, 2020. As of the present date, Plaintiff has failed to file an amended complaint as required by this court. Because of Plaintiff’s failure to file the requisite amended complaint, the court concludes this case should be dismissed. *Tanner v. Neal*, 232 F. App’x 924 (11th Cir. 2007) (affirming *sua sponte* dismissal without prejudice of inmate’s § 1983 action for

failure to file an amended complaint in compliance with court's prior order directing amendment and warning of consequences for failure to comply); *see also Moon v. Newsome*, 863 F.2d 835, 837 (11th Cir. 1989) (explaining that as a general rule, where a litigant has been forewarned, dismissal for failure to obey a court order is not an abuse of discretion.).

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge this case be DISMISSED without prejudice for Plaintiff's failures to comply with the order of the court and to prosecute this action. Further, it is

ORDERED that the parties shall file any objections to this Recommendation on or before **February 24, 2020**. A party must specifically identify the factual findings and legal conclusions in the Recommendation to which objection is made; frivolous, conclusive, or general objections will not be considered. This Recommendation is not a final order and, therefore, is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) shall bar a party from a de novo determination by the District Court of legal and factual issues covered in the Recommendation and waives the right of the party to challenge on appeal the district court's order based on unobjected-to factual and legal conclusions accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982); 11TH CIR. R. 3-1. *See Stein v. Lanning Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981) (en banc).

DONE this 10th day of February, 2020.

/s/ Wallace Capel, Jr.  
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.  
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE